

(1)
THE
Revolution no Rebellion:

Or, Serious

REFLECTIONS

Offered to the Reverend

Mr. BENJAMIN HOADLY,

Occasion'd by his

Considerations on the Bishop of Exeter's Sermon, preach'd before Her
MAJESTY, March the 8th, 1708.

By a CITIZEN of LONDON:
*A Lover of the present Establishment in
Church and State.*

The Third Edition.

To which is added, a POSTSCRIPT
to the Bookfeller.

L O N D O N:

Printed for *Jonah Povey*, at the West-End
of *St. Paul's*.



S

I
preach
1708,
I th
" to
" Hu
Majest
Serm
you fo
vince
" tim
not C
Yo
somet
don't
cern.
(tho'
Trut
derat
" the
" St
" qu
" co
In
" ho
" T
think
part
on th
of hi
Thos
m

S I R,

I Need make no Apology for giving you this trouble, since you have done it for me already, in yours to Lord Bishop of *Exeter*, occasioned by his Sermon preached before Her Majesty, on the 8th. of *March*, 1708, and publish'd by Her special Command.

I think the Truths therein of " the utmost importance " to the Honour of Christianity, and the Security of Letter, " Human Society : And I have reason to believe Her Majesty thought so too. I have diligently read over the Sermon, and your Considerations also, and have here sent you some Remarks I made, as I went along, which convince that the " CAUSE you have been for some- Letter, " time engag'd in, and which you still prosecute, 's p. 1, & 2. not GOOD, however OLD it may be.

You seem to insinuate, as if his Lordship had delivered something in this Sermon, inconsistent with a former. I don't find it; but if it had been so, that is not my concern. I am not vindicating my Lord Bishop of *Exeter*, (tho' I reverence him sincerely) I am only seeking for Truth, and in order to that, I come to your first Consideration, which is, That his Lordship argues, " From " the Magistrate's being called *the Minister of God* by Letter, " St. Paul, that he hath none above him upon Earth, to p. 8. " question, censure, or punish him, and that he is accountable to none but God.

In answer to this, you 1. " Put his Lordship in mind " how St. Paul hath guarded his own Expression, viz. " That *he is the Minister of God for good*. Sure you think his Lordship hath a very short Memory, to forget part of his Text; no, you may see he does not, for on these last Words he grounds the second General Head of his Discourse; and his second Inference from it is, *That Subjects should be content with their Lot, and pay a* Sermon, *obedient Obedience*. This is a natural Inference p. 23. A 2 from

- from these Words; the Magistrate being God's Minister, set to govern *in his stead*, it is our Duty to be obedient; and God having instituted this for the good of Mankind, it is our Interest to be obedient. This I think the plain meaning of the Apostle, so that his inculcating God's gracious Design in appointing Government, and Governours, is not a Limitation of his Exhortation to Obedience and Submission, but an Enforcement of it. That this Opinion is not new, I appeal to the Book of *Homilies*, which you did acknowledge, "Contain'd a godly
 Article, 35. "and wholesome Doctrine, necessary for these Times, when you took possession of your Living. In this Book, (to which I think there is no Answer come out) it is affirmed, *That Kings and Princes, as well the evil as the good, do reign by God's Ordinance, and that Subjects are bounden to obey them.* Many Places of Scripture are brought to prove it; but two special Places in the New Testament, may stand instead of all other; then after quoting at large Rom. 13. and 1 Pet. 2. it thus applies 'em: *By these two Places it is most evident, that Kings, Queens, and other Princes, are ordained of God, are to be obeyed and honoured of their Subjects; that such Subjects as are disobedient, or rebellious against their Princes, disobey God, and procure their own Damnation. Farther, if Servants must obey bad Masters, as well as good, much more must Subjects submit to evil Princes*——Goes on, p. 345. to show the Happiness of being governed by good Princes, and the Obligation Princes lie under to imitate God their King. Afterwards it shows the Misery of being under evil Princes, from Eccles. 10. 16. and Prov. 28. 15, and 16 Verses, whence arises this Question, *What shall Subjects do then? Shall they obey good Princes, and contemn, disobey, and rebel against indiscreet and evil Governours? God forbid. This is a perilous thing, to make Subjects Judges of their Princes, which Prince is good, and which bad*——And in p. 346. *Is not Rebellion the greatest of Mischiefs? And who are most likely to do the greatest of Mischiefs, but the worst of Men? Rebels are aptest to rebel against the best of Princes, especially if they be young in Age; Women in Sex, or gentle and courte-*
- Homily, p. 343.
- Homily, p. 344.
- Homily, p. 345.

ous in Government. Rebellion is worse than the worst Government.

God placeth as well evil Princes as good ones. Will you p. 347.
procure or continue a good Prince? be obedient; would you
be eased of the Mischiefs of a bad one? repent and amend.
St. Paul exhorts Timothy to pray for those in Authority,
which was either Caligula, Claudius, or Nero.

Were these bare Affirmations, they should not be contradicted by those who have acknowledg'd 'em to be godly and wholesome Doctrines, unless they do not continue to think them so, and then methinks they should relinquish the Advantage they reap by that Acknowledgment. But these are far from bare Affirmations, they are backt with such good Reason, and so many plain Texts of Scripture, that I don't doubt but they may be of good use to convince any impartial Reader, that the supreme Magistrate receives his Commission from God, and is to be obeyed and submitted to as his Vicegerent; and that to leave People at liberty, to disobey or resist, when he acts beyond, or contrary to his Commission, and to leave this to the People's Judgment, is to leave it to their Choice, whether they will obey or no.

2. You put his Lordship in mind, " That every Per- Letter,
son in the World, who is the Instrument of Good to p. 20.
us, is the Instrument of God to us for good. Now,

Though it should be so, it does not follow, but some may be entituled to a greater regard than others, as will further appear, in my *Remarks* on your third Answer.

3. Wherein " You beg leave to shew, that the Magi- Ibid.
strates receiving a Commission for one particular Work,
ought not to be an Argument, to prove that there is
none upon Earth that may question, censure or punish
him; and that his Lordship contends, p. 16. that his
Commission is not absolute and unlimited.

'Tis true, the Magistrate is limited by God, whose Servant and Vicegerent he is; and therefore, as his Lordship argues, 1. He ought to make God's Honour Sermon;
his main Design. And 2. He should comply with the p. 10, 11.
Design of his Commission, remembering he must be accountable to God, for to him only he is a Servant; as is plainly

p. 6. plainly proved in these Words, " 'Twould be absurd
 " to say, that he is their Servant over whom he bears
 " Rule, because that would be in effect to say, that it is
 " all one to command, and to obey, to have power over,
 " and to be subject to. This is plain Reasoning, such
 as becomes Truth ; but Schemes that are built upon Sup-
 positions, need fifty Pages full of Words to obscure
 'em.

The Magistrate is appointed for this very thing, *i. e.*
 to govern, therefore the People must needs be subject :
 This Argument holds very good, though the Magistrate,
 (as such) has no Commission to preach the Gospel, or
 minister the Sacraments.

Sermon, I am heartily sorry his Lordship's Fourth Inference is
 p. 14. so very seasonable, and much more so, to see any of the
 23. Clergy cavil at a Discourse, which clearly confutes
 some of the most important Errors in one of the most
 pernicious Books this Age hath produced, fruitful as it is
 of such monstrous Productions : To make the Magi-
 strate's Superiority cease, when he acts beyond his Com-
 mission, and to leave the People to judge when he does
 so, is to set them above him, the Mischiefs and Incon-
 gruity of which are largely set forth in the First Part of
 the *Homily* against *Rebellion*. The Case of a Mayor,
 Letter, (by which you say his Lordship very unfortunately en-
 p. 13. deavours to illustrate his Position) does what he brought
 Sermon, it for most aptly, *i. e.* it shows that an Officer may have
 p. 7. his Nomination from one, and receive his Authority from
 another ; it is true, if he acts beyond his Commission,
 he is accountable, but it is to his Superior, and so the
 chief Magistrate is also ; and who his Superior is, I need
 not remember one, that (if he does his Duty) daily ac-
 knowledges, in a serious solemn manner, that † God is
 † Daily the only Ruler of Princes.

Prayer for
 the Queen.

Letter,

p. 14.

p. 15.

As to your Fourth Answer, That " St. Paul might
 " intend his Exhortation to have respect to deputed Ma-
 " Magistrates, as well as the supreme———And
 that, " It is observable, (what hath been often quoted
 " by the Patrons of *Passive Obedience*) that our Lord
 " told *Pilate*, that his Power was from above.

I need only remind you, that inferior, subordinate Magistrates, receive their Power mediately, as the Supreme do theirs, immediately from God, and are to be obey'd and reverenc'd accordingly ; this is, (I think) a strong Argument for Subjection : If *Pilate's* Power is to be submitted to, because it is from Above, much more is *Cæsar's*.

5. Your Fifth Answer, at first sight, seems an Agreement, that the Magistrate is not accountable, censurable, or punishable. If you were really of this mind, what need had you to contend at all? But you say, " All that is contended for, with any Zeal, is this, That there should be a Right left in the govern'd Society, to preserve it self from Ruin and Destruction, which is a Point his Lordship hath not touch'd upon." p. 85.
p. 15.

The Word RIGHT is of an ambiguous Signification, (the Learned say) if I apprehend your Meaning, it must be here taken for a Power to secure it self, and a Privilege to use that Power. Again, by *Right to secure it self from Ruin*, you must mean, a Right to resist the Magistrate, when it judges it necessary so to do, in order to its Preservation, or else your contest with the Bishop had been needless ; for I believe all agree in these two Things. 1. *That all Persons, and Societies, have a Right to secure themselves by lawful Means.* And, 2. *That none have a Right to do it by unlawful Means.* I look upon the Thing in dispute to be, *Whether resisting the Magistrate be a lawful Means, or no?*

The Negative his Lordship asserts in the Third Inference, from his First General Head, p. 13. and proves it by two Texts of Scripture, p. 14. therefore it lies upon those who dissent from him, to prove that the govern'd Society hath a Power to secure it self, and a Right to use that Power ; for unless it hath both, neither of 'em single will be of any use to it. It is very plain, that Right, without a Power to assert it, will do 'em no good ; and it is as plain, that a good Man, though he have Power or Strength, yet if he have not Right to authorize him, cannot use it : I say cannot, for he lies

under a moral, as the other does under a physical Inability. To illustrate this Matter, the Second Part of the

Homily, *Homily against wilful Rebellion*, furnishes me with a very
 p. 352. pat Example out of the First Book of *Kings*. *David*
 being persecuted causelessly by *Saul*, and having it in his
 1 Sam. 24. power to secure his own Life, by giving consent only to

Saul's Death ; yet, though he knew *Saul* to be under
 God's Displeasure, and that he himself was anointed to
 succeed him, yet, notwithstanding all this, he was so far
 from laying violent Hands on him, that he expresses an

Homily, Abhorrence of so foul a Fact. From which History the
 p. 354. Homily goes on to answer the most plausible Pleas for
From line *Rebellion*, and proves plainly, (I think) that we may
 7. to the not Rebel, though the Prince be hated of God, and
 19th. God's Enemy ; hurtful and pernicious to the Common-
 wealth ; nor though he be unmindful of the Service of his
 faithful Subjects, negligent of the Welfare of them and
 their Posterity ; nay, though he were their known mortal
 Enemy that sought their Lives.

Objection. But notwithstanding this Instance, and the many plain
 Scriptures are named in the *Homily*, to prove that Sub-
 jects may in no case resist their Prince, yet some may
 think what Mr. *Hoadly* contends for, may nevertheless be
 the just Right of the govern'd Society ; for though par-
 ticular Persons may be obliged to submit to the supreme
 Magistrate, in actually obeying what his Laws enjoin,
 and where that can't be complied with, in patiently sub-
 mitting to the Penalty ; yet Magistracy being ordained
 for the good of the Society, if the chief Magistrate
 should so act as to endanger that Society, 'tis his Duty
 to secure, that then the govern'd Society may secure
 themselves, and this may be so, notwithstanding these
 positive general Prohibitions ; and there is a Reason
 urg'd, p. 49. because several general Prohibitions in
 Scripture, are taken in a limited Sense ; so all Separation
 is not Schism ; all Church-Reformation is not
 Church-Destruction ; all Killing is not Murder, &c. In
 answer to this,

I pray consider what will be the Consequence of this way of arguing, viz because some Prohibitions, though exprels'd in a general, are to be taken in a limited Sente, therefore all may be so; thus because all Killing is not Murder, therefore all Adultery is not Sin; and because all Evil-speaking is not Slander, therefore all Stealing is not Sin. I think I need say no more to confute this loose way of Reasoning; if it were necessary, I could easily show, that in all the general Prohibitions you have instanc'd, there is in the Scripture either a Command, or an Allowance, which stands as an Exception to the general Rule; take one for Instance, *Thou shalt not kill*, Exod. 20. 13. yet in Rom. 13. 4. it is said of the Magistrate, that *he beareth not the Sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger, to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil*: And in Gen. 9. 6. *Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed*; by which it is plain, that notwithstanding the general Command, *Thou shalt not kill*, the Magistrate may, and ought to punish Murderers with Death.

Answer.

I must observe, That by thus pleading for a Limitation of this Prohibition of resisting Governours, you own, that without a Limitation, the general Prohibition is against it; therefore in order to prove that the govern'd Society have a Right to secure themselves, by resisting their Governours, (for such a Right you plainly contend for) in order to prove this, I conceive you ought to bring plain Texts of Scripture, which command, or at least allow this Privilege to all governed Societies; or else I can't see but this general Prohibition binds the whole Society, and every individual Member, from resisting the Magistrate; moreover, in order to make use of this Right, there must be some Judge when is the proper time for it. Now, whoever are Judges of this, whether the whole People, or chosen Representatives, they are in this point superior to the supreme Magistrate; which is in effect to say, that he is their Subject, over whom he bears Rule. In short, the general Commands and Prohibitions of Scripture, you own to be at least seemingly against the Resistance

we

we are treating of, and we have no Scriptures brought, that command or allow this *Resistance* to any Persons or Societies in any case, therefore all must be concluded under these general Rules. But if this *Resistance* were allowed in some Cases, I can't perceive the Advantage of it, unless 'twere known where the Right is placed, and who must judge when it is to be us'd, which neither this, nor any Book I have yet seen, gives me any Satisfaction in; therefore how vain is it to contend with so much Zeal for an imaginary Right, which we know not where to find, nor when to assert?

If there be any such reserved Right, surely it must be taken notice of in the *Original Contract* you mention, p. 22. and therefore it is to be hop'd, in the next Edition of your Measures, you will oblige the World with what that *Original Contract* says on this Head; and if it be back'd with as good Reason, and as many and plain Texts of Scripture, as the *Homily* brings to prove, that the Magistrate's Power is from God, and that we Christians are bound to obey evil as well as good Princes; I don't know but it may do your Cause more good, than all the rest of Mr. *Headley's* Works.

As for your Case of habitual or actual Madness, I think neither Divines nor Lawyers so proper to prescribe what is fit to be done in that Case as Physicians: But, (by my Lord *H———*'s Rule, *That what has been, may be*) it is possible the People may be mad, how shall the Nation be secured from ruin then? Why, he that stills the raging of the Sea, can cure the Madness of the People, and of the Prince too, and will do it when he sees fit. This Thought should silence all our Complaints, when we reflect upon our inability to secure our selves from Ruin; and make us adore the Wisdom and Goodness of that All-wise and Gracious God, who hath placed us in this dependent State——. God, says the *Homily*) maketh a wicked Man reign for the sins of the People, Job. 34. 10. and again, God giveth a Prince in his anger, Hos. 13. 6. meaning an evil One. If this be one of God's ways of correcting us for our Faults, and reclaiming us to our Duty, 'twill be better for us to improve it

Homily,
p. 346.

to that purpose, than by contending for a Right to secure our selves from Ruin, to harden our selves in Sin and Impenitency; for had we both Power and Right to secure our selves against this Stroke of divine Vengeance; God hath several other ways, no less severe, to punish sinful and rebellious Man. Those sacred Volumes, which this licentious witty Age treats with such Derision, inform us of exemplary Punishments inflicted upon daring Sinners, enough to make us tremble at the thought of 'em. Fire and Brimstone rain'd down upon *Sodom* and *Gomorrhah*, to punish the filthy Sins of their impure Inhabitants; and the Earth opening and swallowing up *Corah* and his Company, are Instances of God's Almighty Power and Justice, amazing in themselves, and ought to be very awakening unto us, who live in an Age wherein the Sin of the former is acted, and that of the latter defended, with an unusual Impudence.

That I proceed not to examine your other Considerations distinctly, is not because I think them unanswerable, but I don't think it necessary; for in handling this First, I have quoted places of the *Homily* and Scriptures therein mentioned, that (I think) answer the other Three; but if you continue of another Mind, be pleased to read over the *Homilies* concerning *Obedience*, and against *wilful Rebellion*, impartially, and if you are not thereby satisfied, I may give you and my self some further trouble, though I am not fond of it.

As to your Address to his Lordship, p. 44. wherein you insinuate, as if the Doctrines Preached by him, and which I hope I have prov'd to be consonant to Scripture, and the Doctrine of the *Church of England*, as by Law established, were inconsistent with the *Revolution*.

Permit me to speak a little freely, with all the deference due to your holy and honourable Employment. You do great Injustice both to the Revolution, and the whole Nation, in that unfair Insinuation: You cannot but know, that the Accession of King *William* and Queen *Mary* to the Throne, was founded upon the *Abdication* of King *James*, and not upon any *Deprivation* of him for Male-Administration, as will evidently appear

Letter, for what you affirm, without any proof, That " those
 p. 45. of the highest, as well as holiest Rank, and of the best
 " Quality, invited over a Prince with armed Men, to
 " awe their legal King, and force him into a Compli-
 " ance ; and this they did in their private Capacity.
 These are your own Words, which I desire you well to
 note, for if I should say so, I should be called an Enemy
 of the *Revolution*, and I think justly.

I must observe to you, that you own this *Invitation*
 was not a National Act, but made in their private Ca-
 pacity, so that your Inference drawn from it, in 47 and
 48, that it was more a National Act, than the Murther
 of King *Charles I.* is not well-grounded ; though, I
 think, there have been some weekly Writers labouring
 to prove it so. But I don't so much wonder at them,
 they must write as their Masters dictate to them. But
 that a Clergyman of the Church of *England* should so
 far forget the Doctrine of that Church, as to advance
 Notions contrary to her *Liturgy* and *Homilies*, and in
 their Consequence destructive, not only of Monarchy,
 but of all settled Government ; this puts me in mind of
 the Words of the *Psalmist*, *He that hath eaten my bread,*
hath lift up his heel against me.

I believe those Persons of the *highest* and the *holiest*
 Rank, who, (as you say) sent to invite over the Prince,
 did not make you their Confident, though you so
 Letter, roundly affirm, *it was to awe their legal King.* I must
 p. 45. re-mind you, this is barely affirmed, therefore were any
 Consequence to be built upon it, it would be necessary
 to prove it.

I don't wonder, when you have thus endeavoured to
 prove the *Revolution* a *Rebellion*, you proceed in p. 48.
 to call it so : What I wonder at, is the Clemency of
 our Government, that takes no notice of it ; for whe-
 ther it be designed to run down the *Revolution*, or to
 make *Rebellion* appear reputable, it must have an ill
 Influence upon our Established Government : But the
 further Prosecution of these momentous Points, is too
 large a Field to enter upon at the end of a Letter,
 (already,

(already longer than I design'd) were I equal to the Work ; Mr. Attorney-General therefore being better able ; to him I leave it. Only this I must take notice of, that by your thus making *Revolution* and *Rebellion* stand for the same thing, I am instructed what some Men mean, when they say, they are of *Revolution Principles*.

When all's said, let all judicious Men judge, who act most for the Honour of the Church and Christianity ; those, who after the Example of *Christ* and his Apostles, recommend *Obedience* and *Patience*, *Meekness* and *Submission*, both by their Preaching and Practice ; or those, who contrary to the Design of their Office, and to Doctrines which they themselves have assented to, encourage People to censure and oppose their Superiors, by their Writings and Example. Letter, P. 51.

As for the Preachers of this peaceful Doctrine, which you very respectfully call, *The Doctrine of Servitude*, I hope they are not startled at your Threats, when you tell 'em, there will be a Spirit to oppose 'em ; they have always found it so, and I fear will, till that cursed Spirit, who first rebell'd himself, and drew Man into the same Sin, be confin'd for ever to that dismal Abode prepar'd him ; but, for their Comfort, as they have a Spirit to oppose them, so going on in their Duty, they have a Spirit to assist 'em ; and greater is he that is with them, than he that is in the World. Letter, P. 50, 51.

S I R, Though I differ from you in Opinion, I have a respect for your Order, and desire to have so for your Person.

May the good God, who directed the Stone from David's Sling, and often effects great Things by weak and contemptible Means, so prosper these my weak, though well-meant Endeavours, that they may penetrate not only into your Head, but into your Heart, that
being

(14)

being converted, you may strengthen your Brethren, by putting them in mind, to be subject to Principalities and Powers, to obey Magistrates; to be ready to every good Work.

I am,

S I R,

Your—

N. B. The Book of *Homilies* I refer to, was printed in Folio, 1676.

The *Bishop's Sermon* is the *Octavo* Edition.

Mr. *Hoadley's* is the first Edition, three Sheets and a Quarter.

POSTSCRIPT to the Bookseller.

IT is objected, you say, That I had not read Mr. *Hoadly's Measures of Submission*, when I wrote my *Reflections* on his *Considerations*, &c. which I offer'd to him by your Hand. It's true, I had not; and if that be a Fault, I beg his pardon; and I hope I may the more easily obtain it, because if I had read that Book, I must have remark'd upon the many Things he offers in answer to the Twenty sixth Objection; and in doing this, I conceive, I should have been, in Justice, oblig'd to say some things which would not have been for Mr. *Hoadly's* Reputation. If it be a Fault not to have read Mr. *Hoadly's* Book, I believe some of his Friends are guilty of it, or else they would (for his sake) not make this Objection; for I dare leave it to any impartial Reader to judge, whether what I have quoted from the

Measures
of Subm.
p. 152. to
168.

the *Homily*, p. 343, 344, 345, and 347. be not directly opposite to Mr. *Hoadly's* Doctrine; and if so, then the "*Homily* do's condemn the Resistance he defends, and recommends the Submission he condemns, though he hath writ 17 Pages to prove the contrary; and that those who will may the easier judge in this important Affair, I shall briefly set down Mr. *Hoadly's* Doctrine, and the contrary, that by comparing them with the *Homily*, they may see which agrees with, and which contradicts it.

Ditto, p. 154.

Mr. *Hoadly's* Doctrine, which he taught my Lord Mayor, and which he has writ so much in Defence of, is this, viz. That "St. Paul don't recommend a passive Submission, when a Prince contradicts the Design of his Institution; and that so acting he may be opposed, without the shadow of a Crime; nay, with Honour and Glory. And further, That "Submission is due to Governours, meerly for the sake of publick Happiness——and must degenerate into a Crime, when it forsakes the View of that, and betrays it into the Hands of Ambition and Violence.

Ditto, p. 9.

p. 10.

The contrary Doctrine is as follows, viz. "It is our Duty to obey our Governours in whatsoever they command, that is not contrary to the divine Law——and in case the Magistrate does so exceed his Commission, yet there is a Duty lying on Subjects, not to oppose or resist, but quietly and patiently to suffer the Penalty of those Laws, which they can't, without sinning against God, yield an active Obedience to. This is the Doctrine the Bishop of *Exeter* preach'd, which Mr. *Hoadly* opposes, and which I (in my manner) have bore Testimony to; not because his Lordship preach'd it, or because Her Majesty approv'd of it, but because I believe it agreeable to Scripture and Reason, and the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, as deliver'd in the *Homilies*, and confirm'd by divers Passages in her excellent *Liturgy*. This is so evident, that I dare leave it with any impartial Jury, which of the Two Doctrines is contrary to the Doctrine of the *Homilies*; for, sure I am, one of them must needs

Bishop's Sermon. p. 13, 14.

needs be so, unless the *Homilies*, like Answers from the *Heathen Oracles*, may be taken in contrary Senses. I beg no favour of those who will enquire further into this Matter, but for the Truth's sake, and for their own sakes, I do require this, that they will proceed impartially, and not rely on Mr. Hoadly's, or my Word, but read the *Homilies* themselves, which they will find well worth their while, they teaching us in a very plain way, what we are to believe, as well as what we are to do, in order to our Soul's Health. I am sorry so few of our Churches are furnish'd with this Book; I am upon enquiry what Churches in *London* have it, and which want it, in order to inform the Publick, that good People may know where to go to lay in a Stock of useful Knowledge; for tho' we have much good Preaching, there are some useful Truths treated of in that Book, which are but seldom heard of from some Pulpits. I have another Design also in publishing what Churches have have not the Book of *Homilies*, viz. That either the Parishes, or some good People, may provide some for them.

But not to digress any further: If either Mr. Hoadly, or his Friends, think I have not done him Justice with respect to the *Homilies*, I will, (God willing) go on to compleat my *Remarks* on his many Pleas he offers in answer to the Twenty sixth Objection, with all convenient Measures of Subm. speed, and communicate them to him, either privately or publickly, as he and you agree.

London, May the
23d. 1709.

F I N I S.

om the
ases. I
er into
eir own
impar-
rd, but
d well
y plain
we are
y so few
; I am
it, and
k, that
Stock of
a good
d of in
m some
ng what
es, viz.
le, may

Hoadly,
ce with
o on to
s in an
nvenient
privately